REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 16-18 have been amended. Applicant notes that Claims 13 and 16-18 have been amended merely to correct typographical errors noted by Applicant.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Harrisville-Wolff*, et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,950,847). Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are overcome in light of the above amendments.

As the Examiner is aware, a cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claim 1, as amended, states in-part, "a first network managed by a first service provider… a second network managed by a second service provider… and means for automatically provisioning the inter-provider IP service between the first network and the second network". Support for these amendments can be found at least on pages 9-14 of the present application. Similar features can also be found in amended Claim 11. Applicant submits that the above features are not disclosed in *Harrisville-Wolff*.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the client system 104 of *Harrisville-Wolff* reads on Applicant's claimed "first network" and that the client system 116 of *Harrisville-Wolff* reads on Applicant's claimed "second network." In addition, the Examiner indicates that service provider 136 of *Harrisville-Wolff* reads on Applicant's claimed "first

service provider" and that service provider 148 of *Harrisville-Wolff* reads on Applicant's claimed "second service provider." However, as can be seen in Figure 1 of *Harrisville-Wolff* and as is apparent in the corresponding description, client systems 104 and 116 are connected to service providers 136 and 148 via a communications network 132. Client systems 104 and 116 are not "managed by" service providers 136 and 148, as is claimed in the present application.

In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Harrisville-Wolff* of an inter-provider IP service that is provisioned between networks, as is claimed in the present application. Instead, client systems 104 and 116 in *Harrisville-Wolff* merely communicate with the service providers 136 and 148 and a service manager 160 in order to retrieve software updates and software patches from the service providers 136 and 148.

Thus, *Harrisville-Wolff* does not teach, within its four corners, each and every element of, in the detail of, Claims 1 and 11 of the present invention and should be withdrawn as a reference under 35 U.S.C §102. As a result, the § 102 rejections of Claims 1 and 11 are overcome, and withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harrisville-Wolff* in view of *Xu* et al., (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0085912), and Claims 3-10 and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harrisville-Wolff* in view of *Ramstrom* et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,004). Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are overcome in light of the above amendments.

As the Examiner is aware, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a

prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

Claims 2-10 and 12-21 are dependent claims that include the same exemplary features described above with respect to Claims 1 and 11. *Xu* and *Ramstrom* fail to remedy the above-described deficiencies of *Harrisville-Wolff* with respect to Claims 1 and 11 in that none of the references teaches or suggests "*a first network managed by a first service provider... a second network managed by a second service provider... and means for automatically provisioning the inter-provider IP service between the first network and the second network using the first resources and the second resources*". Accordingly, the § 103 rejections of Claims 2-10 and 12-21 are overcome for at least the same exemplary reasons given above with respect to the rejections of Claims 1 and 11.

As demonstrated above, the § 103 rejections of Claims 2-10 and 12-21 are overcome, and withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 2-10 and 12-21 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

AYMAN ESAN NASSAR

Dated: January 23, 2008

/Holly L. Rudnick/

Holly L. Rudnick
Reg. No. 43,065

Garlick, Harrison & Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email) *hrudnick@texaspatents.com*